STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

,,	CEPT	TIONS	DOCU	MENT	

		COPYLI
Command:	Division:	Chapter:
214 - SCC	Valley	6
Inspected by:	Date:	
PSDSI R. Snow	12/16/09	

- age 1 of 2

9		
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection shall be routed to and its due date. This docume improvement, identified deficiencies, corrective and the control of the	on number. Under "Forward to:" enter the nearly shall be utilized to document innovative pr	kt level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level  ☐ Executive Office Level	Total hours expended on the inspection:	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:  Yes No	Division	
Chapter Inspection: Command Gran	nt Management & Command Over	time
Inspector's Comments Regarding In	inovative Practices:	
None.		
Command Suggestions for Statewick	e Improvement:	
ivone.		
None.		
Inspector's Findings:		
In response to a Comm-Net Message conducted the selected inspections o ensure compliance with departmenta	f the Command's Grant Managem	ent and Overtime programs to
The following documents were compl	eted as part of this inspection:	
<ul><li>Exceptions Document</li><li>Command Grant Management</li><li>Command Overtime Checklist</li></ul>	Checklist	
Commander's Response:   Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not Conc	ur shall document basis for response)
None.		
Inspector's Comments: Shall address etc.)		
SCC does not negotiate for overtime	nours or services to be provided d	uring the process of establishing

anv particular agreement and/or contract. SCC provides dispatcher position(s) as support to the project, dupon the amount of "dispatcher" time factored in by negotiating unit.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
214 - SCC	Valley	6
Inspected by:	Date:	
PSDSI R. Snow & 0	12/16/09	

Required Action	]					
				Marine Committee		100
Corrective Actio	n Plan/	Timeline				

N/A

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMPANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer.	1/ // /X/ Ocan	10 10 09
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	1 than 11 h	10.01
	JASPE TOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	K. Jakon III	12-18-09
	San San	12-10-09
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE / ,
employee		12/20/9
Concur Do not concur	The state of the s	12/28/07

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PARTIMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

# JMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Sacramento	Valley	214
Comm. Center		
Evaluated by:	Date:	
Robyn Snow, A(	12/07/09	
Assisted by:	Date:	
Rose Jauregui, A	12/07/09	

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level Command Level Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Commandesi Follow-up Inspection Yes  $\boxtimes$  No For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 te: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes ΠNo  $\bowtie$  N/A Remarks: a grant application to a funding agency other than the See Exemptions Document. Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes □No ⊠ N/A Remarks: for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs ☐ Yes No  $\bowtie$  N/A Remarks: identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for Yes No ⊠ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? 5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes ⊠ N/A No Remarks: Unit (GMU)? 6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when ☐ Yes □ No  $\square$  N/A Remarks preparing concept paper budgets?

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
"PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

# OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7 la aupontina des	····			
7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?		□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks;
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
16. Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
<ul> <li>17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?</li> <li>This would include any of the following: <ul> <li>Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Governor.  • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	overthan a		777/4	TOTAL

'STATE OF CALIFORNIA
'PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **JM™AND INSPECTION PROGRAM** INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

	<del></del>			
18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managem	ent Unit			4
23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?		□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	S ☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## JMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Overtime

Command: Sacramento	Division: Valley	Number: 214
Comm. Center		•
Evaluated by:	Date:	
Robyn Snow, A	12/07/09	
Assisted by:		Date:
Rose Jauregui, A13632		12/07/09

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy. applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command Level Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Date: Follow-up Inspection Yes  $\bowtie$  No For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, HPM 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, apter 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28. ιε: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable overtime being held responsible for paying a Remarks: ☐ Yes □No ⊠ N/A Uniformed personnel do not work minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP reimbursable overtime while assigned uniformed employee, regardless of length of to the Communications Center service/detail? Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation Remarks: ☐ Yes ΠNο ⊠ N/A Reimbursable details are not notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the assigned/scheduled at the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed Communications Center employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation? 3. Are reimbursable special project codes being used for all overtime associated with reimbursable special Remarks: X Yes □ No N/A 4. Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Remarks: X Yes No N/A Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects? 5. Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other Remarks: X Yes □ No □ N/A than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time? 6. Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on Remarks: X Yes No □ N/A a regular day off? 7. Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance -Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant Remarks: X Yes No □ N/A when overtime is associated for civil court?

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
\*\*PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **OMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

_	D 11 O11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11				
8.	Do the CHP 415s with overtime indicate the employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	overtime?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	<ul> <li>Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: Documented on the front of the 415 – under projected absences
13.	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 17.	Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: